

RECUSANT HISTORY

A Journal of Research in Post-Reformation
Catholic History in the British Isles

*Published under the editorial direction of the
Catholic Record Society*

Vol. 4. No. 4
January 1958

[Continuing 'BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES']

THE ARUNDEL PRESS · BOGNOR REGIS
1958

RECUSANT HISTORY (formerly BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES) is issued three times annually (in January, April and October). The price is 12s. 6d. (U.S.A. \$2.00) for the three issues.

Subscriptions should be addressed to : The Manager, Recusant History, The Arundel Press, Sussex Rd., Bognor Regis.

Material submitted for publication should be addressed to: The Editor, Recusant History, c/o The Arundel Press, Sussex Rd., Bognor Regis.

Attention is called to the fact that all articles published in 'Recusant History' are copyright and may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, without permission.

The CATHOLIC RECORD SOCIETY, in addition to sponsoring 'Recusant History', publishes in its annual volumes documents concerning the history of the Catholic Church, and of Catholics, in England since the Reformation. The subscription is £2. 2s. per annum and entitles members to the Society's volumes (but not to 'Recusant History' which should be ordered separately from the Arundel Press). Particulars about the work of the Society and about reduced rates of subscription for those who elect to covenant may be obtained from: The Secretary, Catholic Record Society, c/o Bishop's House, St George's Rd., London S.E.1.

RECUSANT HISTORY

Joint Editors

A.F. ALLISON *of the Department of Printed Books at the
British Museum and Honorary Librarian to the Catholic
Record Society.*

D.M. ROGERS *of the Bodleian Library, Oxford.*

Contents of Vol.4 No.4.

English Catholics without a Bishop, 1655-1672.	<i>Page</i>
By T.A. Birrell	142

ENGLISH CATHOLICS WITHOUT A BISHOP 1655-1672

By T.A. BIRRELL

The period from 1655 to 1672 forms a convenient unit in Recusant history. After the death on 18 March 1655 of Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, there was a series of attempts by the English clergy to obtain from Rome the appointment of a bishop for England, which culminated in the issue of a brief for the consecration of Philip Howard OP on the 16 May 1672. In spite of this, Howard's consecration did not take place, and the English Catholics were without a form of episcopal government till 1685, when John Leyburne was appointed Vicar Apostolic. The reasons for this state of affairs have been the subject of some comment, not all of it well-informed, by those who have treated of English Catholic history in the seventeenth century. The purpose of the present study is to try to present, as objectively as possible, the course of events as it is reflected in the negotiations of the successive agents sent to Rome on behalf of the English clergy during the period 1655-72, together with the relevant background.

Events immediately previous to Smith's death.

The general pattern of the situation at Smith's death calls for a brief explanation. Smith had left England and withdrawn to France in 1631, after an episcopate marked by bitter dissensions between himself and the Regular clergy. It is sometimes assumed that, on his withdrawal to France, he retired altogether from participation in English affairs, but this is not the case¹. He asserted to the end his authority over the Secular Clergy by means of the Chapter which had been erected by his predecessor, William Bishop, and reorganized and enlarged by himself, though it had never been expressly confirmed by Rome.

In the years immediately preceding Smith's death, a split had developed within the Chapter itself. The two principal opponents in the quarrel were Thomas White (usually known by his alias 'Blaclo'), the author of several theological books of more than dubious orthodoxy, and Dr. George Leyburne, who in 1652 became President of Douay College. The chief subjects in dispute were: 1) the orthodoxy of Blaclo's theological views. Leyburne strenuously sought to secure the condemnation of his books at Rome. 2) the authority of Smith over the Chapter. Blaclo and his supporters wanted to be independent of the authority of the aged bishop and to secure from Rome at least a coadjutor for him, if not three more bishops for England.

Leyburne, for his part, consistently upheld Smith's authority. 3) the question of allegiance to Cromwell or to the exiled Charles. This does not come into the open until 1655 when Blaclo published his book *The Grounds of Obedience and Government*, in which he made it clear that he favoured a rapprochement with the Cromwellian government. Leyburne always supported the Royalist cause.

There had been many preliminary skirmishes throughout the sixteen-forties, but a decisive stage was reached when, from Paris, on 6 August 1649, Bishop Smith, describing himself as "Ordinarius Catholicorum Angliae", summoned the Chapter to meet in London². Peter Fitton was then Dean and George Gage secretary. Smith nominated Leyburne as his Vicar General *in solidum*, but this aroused fierce opposition, and he therefore nominated also Mark Harrington (a supporter of Blaclo) as a second Vicar General³. The Chapter in England, and some of their adherents abroad (including Dr. Henry Holden at Paris) were anxious at this juncture to secure some form of toleration from Cromwell's party in return for an Oath of Allegiance to the new government and the banishment of the Jesuits. Bishop Smith, Dr. Leyburne and others of the clergy with Royalist sympathies opposed this, and Leyburne's presence at the 1649 Chapter meeting was to ensure that the Chapter did not compromise itself with the government. Feeling between the two parties was bitter. Holden went so far in his hostility to Leyburne as to try to secure his arrest while in England⁴. The lines of division were certainly by now quite clear, and in the last years of Smith's life the rift widened still further, one part of the Chapter insisting with increasing vehemence on their independence from his authority⁵.

Matters came to a head in May 1653 when Mark Harrington, without Smith's concurrence, convened a Chapter meeting for July. When it assembled on 11 July, the Chapter proposed sending an agent to Rome to ask for a coadjutor for Smith and for three other bishops for England. On 25 July Smith, acting on Leyburne's information, issued a letter dissolving the Assembly and negating its acts. On 1 August the Chapter justified its actions, and on 19 August Smith retracted his censures and made them only conditional on any attempt directly to attack his authority⁶. In the eyes of Smith's opponents in the Chapter, the chief obstacle to their plans for independence was Leyburne, who since 1652 had been President of Douay and thus in a position of great influence. Their major fear was that he might be appointed Smith's successor when the latter died.

Laurence Plantin's Agency.

Smith's death in 1655 opened a phase of positive negotiations. The Chapter appointed Laurence Plantin as their Agent in Rome and instructed him to propose either Henry Taylor or Henry Turberville as Bishop (the draft proposals also have the name of William Clifford, but this was subsequently deleted)⁷. One of the lines of argument which the Chapter authorised Plantin to put forward was that if no bishop were appointed to succeed Smith, they—as the Chapter—would feel themselves empowered to govern the clergy in their own right—"If the Clergy obtain not a Bishop they will stand upon their Chapter's authority to the which they conceive the Pope's confirmation not necessary"⁸.

In October Plantin was in Paris, sounding the leading English Catholics there. He called on Abbot Montagu and his chaplain Robert Pugh, and later on Fr. Stephen Gough the Oratorian, all of whom were sympathetic; Gough promised to write to the Dutch Vicar Apostolic, James de la Torre, Archbishop of Ephesus, then in Rome, to ask him for his help⁹. Dr. Henry Holden, William Clifford and Thomas Carre (*vere* Miles Pinkney) were all favourable to the project¹⁰.

Plantin's report from Paris was addressed to the new Secretary of the Chapter, John Sergeant (*alias* Holland) a supporter of Blaclo and a strong advocate—at this time—of rapprochement with the Cromwellian government. Sergeant replied on 15 October warning Plantin against any idea of proposing Abbot Montagu as bishop, "because he is known to have tampered in the King's affair". (In his first draft of the letter Sergeant had written: "he will be very ungrateful to our Government because he is looked upon here as one who hath treated much for the King in his pretences against them and therefore we do not accept of his government nor render him obedience".)¹¹

Meanwhile in a letter on 22 September to Mangelli, the acting Internuncio at Brussels, Leyburne had put forward the names of four *episcopabiles*: (i) Henry Taylor, (ii) Peter Fitton (who had in fact already declined, on grounds of infirmity, the Chapter's offer to nominate him, though Leyburne did not know this)¹², (iii) William Clifford, and (iv) Edward Daniel¹³. The fact that both the Chapter and Leyburne were in agreement on Taylor as the first choice for bishop was a hopeful sign. Unfortunately Taylor's chances as a compromise candidate were blocked by the personal intervention of Henrietta Maria, who objected to the Pope that Taylor was too closely connected with Spanish influence, and herself put

forward the name of William Clifford¹⁴. Taylor was in fact chaplain to the Archduke Leopold and had served the Spanish Court on diplomatic service in Poland and England. The Internuncio described him as one who had risen from humble birth to better fortune, who was obedient to the Holy See and averse from Jansenism¹⁵. The Queen's opposition to Taylor's candidature was a very unfortunate initial setback.

Meanwhile Plantin had arrived in Rome on 20 November 1655 and had visited the Dutch Vicar Apostolic, de la Torre. He reported to the Chapter: "I have been with the Bishop of Holland and delivered your letter which I had of Mr Fitton. He took it kindly and assured me of his assistance, but having enough to do for his own business I cannot expect much from him. Besides I am told he is without any power"¹⁶. Plantin's negotiations dragged on during the winter and on 14 February 1656 he reported that the Congregation of Propaganda were determined "point blank" against a bishop for England: "In a hot bout I had with Albizzi, one of the three [members of the congregation] and a great stickler of the Patres, [i.e. Jesuits], I discovered that he was the man that had done this good office partly to please the Patres and partly out of a hatred to Sir Kenelm Digby who had to do with this business in Innocent's time . . . they would fain put upon us an Archpriest which I have absolutely protested against as a thing both odious and inconsistent with our safety"¹⁷. Plantin then proposed to drop the question of a bishop and go forward with the question of the confirmation of the Chapter; but not much help was to be expected either of the Archbishop of Ephesus or of the Spanish Ambassador. Sergeant replied on 10 March strongly discountenancing any attempt to press for confirmation of the Chapter. Plantin should "desist from any such pretence, for besides that it is never likely to be granted, it may occasion our less Authority by its denial and turn to our great prejudice"¹⁸. By 21 March Plantin reported that the Congregation had definitely refused a bishop and that the Chapter was neither confirmed nor condemned. Finally, he intended to appeal directly to the Pope¹⁹. On 3 April Plantin reported to Sergeant the result of his final interview with Alexander VII: contrary to his expectations, the Pope held out hope of a bishop within seven months. Before leaving Rome Plantin recommended the care of the Agency to Robert Pendrick, a Scotsman: "He hath been divers years agent for the Queen in this Court, knowing the language well, hath great acquaintance, he is honest, faithful and able, so found both by me and Mr Fitton before me"²⁰. Plantin's last action before winding up his Agency was to ask the Dutch Vicar Apostolic, de la Torre, to recommend the name of Henry Taylor to the Brussels Internuncio on his way back to Holland²¹.

The Pope's promise of a decision within seven months naturally aroused varying reactions. Within two days, on 5 April, Fr. Thomas Courtney SJ (Rector of the English College, Rome, 1640-44 and subsequently English Penitentiary of St. Peter's) wrote to Cardinal Barberini to say that he had heard that Propaganda had offered to give England a Vicar Apostolic "*secundo d'usanza di Olanda*". He requested Barberini to avoid the disaster which would be the inevitable consequence of such a decision. The political situation was such that Cromwell would say that the appointment of a Vicar Apostolic was a Spanish stratagem and that it was part of the preparations for an invasion by the exiled King Charles II. It would unite the Protestant states on the side of Cromwell and give a motive for further persecution. He concluded with the warning: "*Non si deve misurare l'Inghilterra con Olanda. Troppo grand differenza è di genio, di legge, di persecutione*"²².

While Taylor's name was still being canvassed, it was rumoured that the name of Abbot Montagu was also being put forward in certain quarters. On 26 October 1656 Sergeant wrote to Holden, Clifford and Carre at Paris complaining that they had put forward the name of Montagu without the consent of the Chapter. On 20 December they replied jointly that the charge was incorrect, but that Henrietta Maria had objections to Taylor and that the Chapter should put forward a wider selection of names to choose from²³.

In November 1657 the Chapter met and decided on six names to be put forward; the list included neither Montagu, nor George nor John Leyburne (his nephew), nor Ludovic Stuart Aubigny (whose possible promotion to the Cardinalate had already been mooted in the reign of Charles I). The meeting was a stormy one, but the supporters of Dr Leyburne were outnumbered. One of them, Thomas Progers, recorded his protest against: (i) the doubtful authority of the Chapter; (ii) the fact that they refused to condemn the doctrines of Blaclo; and (iii) the fact that the list of *episcopabiles* excluded Montagu, the Leyburnes and Aubigny. He wrote: "It much increased my suspicion of their being satisfied in this present government, and not desiring a bishop, to see them so peremptory in refusing to subscribe to a disclaimer from all novelties and scandalous opinions taught by Mr White or any other"²⁴.

The Agency of Richard Lassels (alias Bolds).

In March 1658 the Chapter informed the Pope that Robert Pendrick was their general Agent and that Richard Lassels was to be their Agent for the special

mission concerning the appointment of a bishop for England²⁵. Lassels's instructions were issued on 11 June 1658: (i) the bishop must be an ordinary (*cum potestate ordinarii*); (ii) he must be one of those named; (iii) if any other person or any other form of authority was proposed, the Agent was to reject the proposal²⁶. "These manly sentiments", as Joseph Berington calls them, were, however, modified by a second set of instructions. If the Agent found the Congregation in favour of a person who was not one of the six proposed, and if he were a person favourable to the Chapter, the Agent was to nominate him on behalf of the Chapter; at all events the Agent was to "stick firmly to" the Chapter's right of nomination. The Agent should also make it clear that the maintenance of a bishop would be at the cost of the Chapter and without any burden to the Holy See²⁷.

Very little seems to have come of Lassels's mission; in fact Dodd implies that Lassels declined to undertake it, though he certainly visited Rome at this time²⁸. One of the secular clergy writing to Sergeant in December 1658 offered his suggestions on the conduct of the Agency: "I am sorry there be so many Popes at Rome. Your best course is to petition and humble yourselves to them that rule the roost, and tell them you will have no Bishop but one of their Order, or such a one as shall swear or vow blind obedience to their Provinciaall here *pro tempore existenti*. This way you may chance to speed. Or you may send 100 or 200 pieces of English gold to Alexander's nephews; the rarity of the coin may take; *munera placant* and red caps love money"²⁹.

The Agency of Francis Gage.

On 7 March 1659 Francis Gage was appointed as special Agent at Rome for the Chapter and Clergy³⁰. After nearly a year of negotiations Gage reported a flat refusal from the Secretary of the Congregation for English affairs^{30a} to grant his requests; indeed the Secretary saw no need at all for an Agent at Rome³¹. Gage asked to be recalled, and on 29 March 1660 he decided to put in writing his advice for any future Roman Agents: (i) "Not to receive a superior but one of our own election"; (ii) "not to admit of any superior contrary to the Ancient Laws of England"; (iii) "never to abandon our Dean and Chapter"³².

But the news of the Restoration of the monarchy in England roused new hopes. By 26 April 1660 Gage sounded more cheerful, and asked Sergeant for further possible names of *episcopabiles* — he had already four: Mr Humphrey Ellis, Mr Falkener, Mr Stephen Lee and Mr Richard Lassels³³. In a letter of 13 June, written

to one of the English clergy resident in France, possibly Montagu, he gives a considered appreciation of the situation which is worth quoting in full, as it clearly reveals his willingness to compromise:

"Most honoured Sir, some few months ago I signified unto you the order I had from England in case I could not obtain a Bishop with ordinary power, to return home, and accordingly I made ready to begin my journey. But in taking my leave of the Court, I found a great unwillingness in many of the chief ministers to let me go without any satisfaction. They and the encouragement of some of our friends in England prevailed with me to stay some few months longer, whereby I have with much importunity gotten the congregation deputed for our affairs to meet in consult about them; I having beforehand given up unto them a true relation of the state of our clergy and the necessity of putting some redress to the disorders grown up amongst us, especially for want of a lawful and unquestionable Authority to govern us. The experience I have gained of the knowledge of this court hath discovered to me an error in the manner of our proceeding hitherto, which was as it were to give the law unto them, by not only exposing our necessities, but also prescribing unto them the particular means to supply them; which they that sit at the highest Tribunal cannot brook, and upon this account did ever reject our suing for an ordinary, the confirmation of the Chapter, and the like. But now I have taken this course barely to express our necessities, and to request such redresses as in their wisdom they shall think fit. Wherefore, after much debate, it is in a manner resolved to grant us a bishop, though his power and faculties are not yet agreed upon and as to the quality of Ordinary I see little hope to obtain it, both in regard they allege that neither of our former Bishops were truly such, though they had the same faculties which Ordinaries have, but their power over England was by delegation and *ad beneplacitum*, which is opposite to the nature of an Ordinary, as also because it was never seen in the Church, that one man was Ordinary over a whole kingdom or two, so that I believe that the most we shall be able to procure will be a Vicar Apostolic such as the Bishop in Holland is: Though for the name of Vicar peradventure we may waive it. This I foresaw long ago like to be the height of what we were to expect from the court, and therefore represented it to the consideration of our brethren in England, who as in all things else were in this point also mainly divided, some being content to accept of such an one rather than nothing; others conceiving this like to be the ruin of our clergy by bringing it and all that accept of such an extraordinary Authority, under the lash of *premunire*, according to the Ancient laws of the kingdom. For my part I am so much a friend to order and discipline, that I should easily prefer a legal and well grounded government before this tottering and problematical Authority that is amongst us, which men submit to rather out of compliment than obedience, and as easily cast off when they please. It's strange what means were used to poison the good intentions of the congregation towards us, especially by the monks' agent here³⁴, who amongst other things persuaded the Cardinals, that our king desired that no Bishop should be sent into England. For other news I have none worth your knowledge and therefore

most humbly take leave, and remain, your most faithful servant, F. Gage.³⁵

On 20 June William Leslie, the Agent for the Scots and Dutch clergy at Rome, wrote a long letter to Humphrey Ellis, the Dean of the Chapter, urging the establishment of a permanent Agency at Rome and commenting favourably on the progress of Gage's negotiations; Leslie considered that the power of the Regulars at Rome to hinder the negotiations was exaggerated in England³⁶.

Gage's interpretation of the situation at Rome was that Propaganda was prepared to grant only a Vicar Apostolic and that anything else was out of the question. He urged the Chapter to accept this, and by doing so at least secure someone of their own choosing; if the Chapter were intransigent there was a likelihood that Propaganda would appoint Dr. Leyburne as Vicar Apostolic on the Dutch model, and the Chapter would be even worse off than they were before. Thomas Carre and Dr. Holden had written urging him to insist on an ordinary, but with the proviso that "rather than fall upon the rock of Schism to accept of a Vicar Apostolic or anything that may keep a lawful jurisdiction amongst us"³⁷. The reaction of Sergeant and the Chapter to these signs of compromise in Gage was to order him to withdraw from Rome, and to step up their attacks in all directions on Dr. Leyburne. On 16 November 1660 the Chapter sent a long letter of complaint against Leyburn to the new Brussels Internuncio, and on 2 December Sergeant followed this up with a personal letter of the same tenor to the Paris Nuncio³⁸.

The Chapter's recall of Gage just when negotiations seemed propitious for a Vicar Apostolic well bears out the judgment of Robert Pugh that the Chapter were really not in earnest about a bishop at all³⁹.

Gage's Agency at Rome must of course be seen in the light of the official reports to the Protector, Chigi, by the Internuncio at Brussels. In a survey of the situation at the Restoration, the Internuncio, de Vecchii, recounted the history of the English Mission from the times of the Archpriest controversy and advised the appointment of a bishop; the principal obstacles were the heterodox doctrines of Blacio and the dubious authority of the Chapter⁴⁰. He was kept informed of the English situation by Dr. Leyburne, who was over in England by the autumn of 1660. Leyburne's reports reveal that he had visited Clarendon who had said that the secular clergy should have a bishop, but one only, and someone loyal to the king. Leyburne had also visited the leading London Chaptermen who had refused to declare against Blacio's

doctrines or to subscribe to a condemnation of Jansenism. The Oaths were another difficulty; as they stood the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy were unacceptable, but the seculars and regulars had met to devise an oath formula that could lawfully be taken. Nonetheless a book had appeared, of which Sir Kenelm Digby was the suspected author, which argued that the present oath of Allegiance could lawfully be taken; Sir John Wintour, too, advocated acceptance of the oaths^{40a}. Finally, at the end of the year, Leyburne reported the failure of his efforts. At the instance of the Chapter, George Digby, Earl of Bristol, had urged him to desist from pressing for an anti-Blaelo declaration; as for the question of the oaths, Bristol wanted the whole question of formulas to be dropped, and would try to rely on a simple assurance to the king of the loyalty of the Catholic nobility⁴¹.

Indeed, Gage's mission collapsed in the end because the Chapter were hoping for some striking change in the situation in England. Charles II was anxious for some ecclesiastical title for his nephew Ludovic Stuart Aubigny. In 1661 there had been plans for making him Bishop of Dunkirk, i.e. though belonging to the French hierarchy he would be bishop of an English possession. The scheme came to nothing, but in October 1662 Sir Richard Bellings went from the English court on a special mission to Rome for the purpose of obtaining a cardinalate for Aubigny. The mission failed, and part of its failure should be seen in the light of the activities of the Catholics in England in the period immediately preceding.

In 1661 a committee of the House of Lords had been set up to consider the removal of the Penal Laws. The leading Chaptermen were prepared in return to agree to the exclusion of the Jesuits from the general repeal, and to advocate an oath of allegiance denying the Pope's deposing power⁴². The campaign against the Jesuits was conducted in pamphlets and in private letters by Dean Ellis, Secretary Sergeant and Dr. Holden⁴³. At their General Assembly of September 1661 the Chapter, at the instigation of Sergeant, resolved *inter alia* that they had succeeded to and were possessed of the authority of the late Bishop of Chalcedon, *sede vacante*, and that they renounced "all foreign power, temporal of Prince or ecclesiastical of the Pope, inasmuch as he shall pretend to free us from obedience to his Majesty or depose him from his throne", and that they would not receive any Bulls, Breves or decrees sent by the Pope without the approval and consent of the King if the King so desired⁴⁴.

A further significant Chapter "consult" was held in August 1662. It appears

from the records of this meeting that during the course of the year, a series of conferences of the regular and secular clergy had been held—the Jesuits excluded: “the Jesuits were not thought of as being held too addicted to their own ways.” The representatives of the Chapter, i.e. the Dean and Secretary, Ellis and Sergeant, had produced a declaration of allegiance which the regulars, Dominican, Benedictine and Franciscan, had not been able to accept. The Chapter now decided, therefore, that it was prepared to negotiate alone with Clarendon, the Lord Chancellor⁴⁵. In this same year the Dean and Chapter gave their blessing to the formulary of the Irish Remonstrance, drawn up, it must not be forgotten, in London, by Peter Walsh and the Bishop of Dromore⁴⁶.

The Bellings mission and its failure has already been described in detail by Professor Ruth Clark⁴⁷. The whole project for a Bishopric or Cardinalate for Aubigny probably did the English Catholic cause more harm than good. There was a real fear among Catholics that the Chapter was using the whole Aubigny project to secure a relaxation of the penal laws at the price of discrimination against the Jesuits, and the enforcement of some declaration of allegiance which would repudiate the Pope’s authority over Catholics in this country. On 5 December 1662 an English Catholic wrote to Fr. John Poyntz SJ at Rome: “Mr Belling was departed before I came to town . . . He is doubtless one who deserves much of the good opinion you have there of him, and as we believe, of himself very orthodox, yet being to follow punctually his instructions he may likely propose something in the behalf of some scribbling Irish friars not so orthodox as himself such as busy themselves too forwardly with pressing our English likewise to subscribe their Irish Protestation against the Pope’s power”⁴⁸.

Rome’s refusal to grant Aubigny a Cardinalate deeply offended Charles II, but he behaved with consideration and tact towards his Catholic subjects, suppressing the Chapter proposals lest the Catholics “should be involved in internal dissensions and end by exposing those who remained faithful to the Pope to all the rigours of the previously existing laws”⁴⁹.

William Leslie intervenes.

As the pontificate of Alexander VII drew to its close in 1667, William Leslie at Rome began once more to urge the question of a bishop. He wrote at length to Lord Henry Howard, brother of Philip Howard OP, the Queen’s almoner, to urge him to come to Rome to act as an impartial and independent Agent in this affair.

For Howard's information, Leslie sent a voluminous account of the religious situation in England since the Reformation, and a series of trenchant profiles of the Cardinals of the Roman Curia at the time⁵⁰. Lord Henry was, however, unwilling to undertake the Agency or, indeed, to run the risk involved in correspondence with Leslie. He handed over Leslie's papers to Lord Arlington, and a copy now reposes in the Public Record Office with the following note: "Memorandum. This was copy of a Paper written to Mr Henry Howard of Norfolk 1667 by one Lesley a Scotch priest at Rome, and by him for his own discharge communicated to my Lord Arlington, with renunciation of all such correspondencies for the future. Joseph Williamson." On 30 August 1667 Lord Henry Howard wrote a letter to Leslie which, according to Canon Tierney, displays "so beautiful a picture of his own mind and character—of the prudence that guided and the loyalty that animated him." In this letter Howard, besides refusing to have any "manner of tampering with Rome", declares: "In secular matters and things not of faith, but of secular power and interest, should the pope himself come with an army to invade us, I dare swear that ne'er an understanding papist in England but would, upon that score, shoot a bullet in his head; for I am sure I would: for, in all matters abstracting from secular government and our copyholds here, I'll believe as far as any in spiritual matters"⁵¹. But he does not reveal to Leslie that he is delating Leslie's letters to the Secretary of State.

Alexander Holt as Agent.

Leslie had also written to Dr. Leyburne expressing hopes of a bishop and urging an Agency. When they came to hear of this the Chapter were disturbed. Among the points to be considered at their General Meeting of May 1667 were noted:

"(i) Whether at this juncture it may be convenient to petition for a Bishop. (ii) Whether the having a bishop may not make void and null the Chapter, or to have some regular made bishop and put upon the Clergy to govern them. (iii) Which episcopal men are to be proposed and how many. (iv) What title the Bishop shall be accepted with; and being it is very probable a Bishop will not be guaranteed but with the title of Apostolical Vicar, that good and solid reasons be given that may satisfy all the clergy why a Bishop cannot be accepted with that title. (v) That it be considered how a Bishop may be maintained"⁵². Eventually the Chapter decided to appoint a new Agent, Alexander Holt⁵³, who favoured the policy of the Dean and Secretary.

Sergeant wrote a personal letter to Montagu on 10 August 1667, accrediting

Holt as Agent and giving six names of *episcopabiles* (of whom, this time, Montagu himself was the first), but hinting that, "perhaps we may fear some difficulty at Rome to obtain that Authority which only we dare admit, that is an Ordinary as Bishop"⁵⁴. Holt also carried with him to Rome an official letter from the Chapter which was loud in denunciation of Dr. Leyburne who "hath for this twenty years perpetually disquieted our church, calumniated his brethren and almost ruined our Colleges"⁵⁵. In this letter the Chapter urged that Leyburne's calumnies against them at Rome should be disregarded, as being due to spite against them for not having nominated him to be bishop⁵⁵. Another letter from the Chapter, dated 27 August, was given to Holt for Cardinal Antonio Barberini, but was not delivered because Barberini was in France at the time of Holt's arrival in Rome. In this letter the Chapter urged that John Leyburne, Dr. George Leyburne's nephew, be appointed president of the English College at Douay, "*donec turbulentus Frater noster, D. Georgius Leyburn, qui cuncta pro arbitrio regit (seu verius pessundat) in Collegio Duaceno, et, imperitandi libidine ductus, factionibus pro more suo cuncta miscere conatur in Anglia, pacem atque ordinem nostrum perturbaverit*"⁵⁶.

The more important items of Holt's instructions are worth giving at length:-

"3. That when it shall be fit to declare he move first that this Bishop be an Absolute Ordinary, such as was given in the Primitive times to Churches in persecution; at least that His Holiness please to declare in his Patent that he constituted him Ordinary of England.

4. In case that cannot be maintained, then to supplicate for a Bishop in the same tenor as my Lord of Calcedon was: that is, with the faculties and powers of an Ordinary here, and that he endeavour what he can, to get that power well and indisputably expressed.

5. That he be one of the six named by the Clergy [i.e. Walter Montagu, Thomas Godden, Humphrey Ellis, John Leyburn, Francis Gage, and Robert Manly].

6. That if any other Title or Authority, inconsistent with what formerly belonged to our Bishops be endeavoured to be imposed, then that he resolutely oppose it, and disclaim from it, as directly forbidden by the State, and against the constant sense of our Brethren.

7. That if he hear anything objected against the Authority of the present Chapter, he be ready modestly to defend it, by laying open how it was instituted, how accepted, how long [*blank in ms.*] and how allowed by his Holiness' Predecessor, and corresponded with from time to time. Also, that if he hear anything against us for doctrine, he be ready to clear us by alleging how we censured Mr. Blacko's books.

8. That if he judges it compassable, he endeavour to join with the Dowetians in this conjuncture to out Dr. Leyburne and get Mr. John Leyburne put in his place.

9. That in case they at Rome nominate some other person for a Bishop, if you think he will be very grateful to our Clergy, to accept of him; not as nominated by them, lest you wrong our right to nomination (which you are desired to stick to) but declare that you have power to nominate in our names; and, so, seeing this person grateful to our Clergy and acceptable to them, you nominate him accordingly"⁵⁷.

Accompanying the instructions were confidential directions "how to manage" them, written by John Sergeant "by order of the Chapter". Concerning point 5 Sergeant adds: "If Dr. Leyburne be nominated, signify how by unanimous vote of our brethren in two General Assemblies he has been positively excluded and excepted against by the Representatives of the Clergy as their implacable enemy and most unjust calumniator. Add his misgovernment of the College, and that therefore, were he our best friend, we durst not in Prudence or Conscience think him fit to govern a Church, who hath so strangely misgoverned his family." Concerning point 6, and the powers of the bishop, he adds: "To receive an Extraordinary Authority hath been expressly interdicted us by a message from his Majesty, viz. in Archivis Capituli, and frequently by his Minister of State, whom we dare not disgust on any consideration not falling within the compass of tenets or practices of Faith . . . in a word, that the Lord Aubigny, when he attempted to be Vicarius Apostolicus was reclaimed against by the Laity and diverse Religious; and himself professed that considering our Laws, he durst not attempt it without a diploma from the King, which he in vain hoped to obtain." Concerning point 7 and the authority of the Chapter, it had been acknowledged by all the secular Clergy for the past forty years, "none disobeying or questioning it, till Dr. Leyburne, angry we would not make him our superior (whom we judged for his disquiet nature and factious proceedings unworthy of that dignity), began to make a Schism and gathered hands to piece up a faction of some few weak followers, not one eminent man having adhered to him." As a last resort, the Agent might put forward the following reasons for the maintenance of the Chapter's authority: "First, that His Majesty and the State are very well satisfied with the Dean and Chapter; that the State Officers converse civilly with us, and advise us of imminent danger; that they have a good conceit of our Allegiance; and, therefore, if anything be attempted against us, they would judge 'tis to bring in some other Authority, of the nature of which they cannot be as confident as they are of this: and consequently they will be ready to hinder the reception of any act against the Chapter, as savouring of Extraordinary Authority." If Rome decided anything against the Chapter, the Agent was to return home"⁵⁸.

Francis Gage wrote to Holt with advice for the conduct of the Agency, even down to such details as what he should wear. The archives of the Agency, he said, were with Robert Pendrick who lived in the Strada Gregoriana; if he should be dead, Holt was to ask William Leslie, who lived in the Propaganda. Holt should keep on good terms with Lord Thomas Somerset and the Rector of the English College Rome, "but beware to have anything to do with the scholars." "In my time," he said, "a Mgr. Alberigi and Abbate Hilarione were persons well affected to our country and our cause. Cardinal Albici was one of our greatest enemies; nor was Barberino at all our friend"⁵⁹.

On arriving in France, Holt wrote back on 24 September 1667 to Mr John Singleton, Treasurer to the Chapter, saying that in France the interpretation of his instructions was that the Chapter did not want a Bishop⁶⁰. Four days later he wrote to Dean Ellis (then living with Lord Baltimore) saying that Abbot Montagu had suggested that "we make a total submission of ourselves to his present Holiness [i.e. Clement IX, elected 20 June 1667], signifying that we are ready to accept whatsoever he shall judge most convenient for us"⁶¹. Such a declaration would disarm Dr. Leyburne's accusation of insubordination in the Chapter. Whatever the effect of this proposal might have been in Rome, its repercussions in the Chapter were immediate and far-reaching. John Sergeant's behaviour in obstructing this proposal so irritated the moderate members of the Chapter that he was eventually compelled to resign as Secretary, and John Leyburne was appointed in his place. With Sergeant's removal from office in the Chapter, the way was open for the possibility of some compromise⁶².

The efforts of the Chapter to dislodge Dr Leyburne from Douay, however, continued unabated. Complaints against him were directed to the Internuncio at Brussels, the Nuncio at Paris, and Philip Howard OP, the Queen's Lord Almoner⁶³. Holt, at Rome, referred a list of complaints against him to the Pope and asked for a visitation of Douay by the French Nuncio⁶⁴. In fact, Holt seems to have devoted more of his first months in Rome to intriguing against Leyburne than in urging a bishop. On 10 December 1667 he wrote to John Singleton, warning the Chapter against William Leslie: "Pray beware you meddle not with Mr Leslie or his Propaganda, for I have discovered clearly that every motion which steers that way, tends to our immediate ruin". Holt clearly feared that Leslie and Propaganda favoured a Vicar Apostolic and that George Leyburne was to be the man⁶⁵. On 24 December he asked Singleton for more testimonies against Leyburne:

"Procure me a letter from Mr H.H. [Henry Howard] to the Protector: speak also fairly to Mr. Montagu in France that he oppose not but assist us, as you know he promised. And if none of these be of sufficient force to gain our right, bethink yourselves how to make friends by the power of France; that seems to me a good reserve . . . I learned from a friend . . . that Mr. President agrees not with the French, he being too much Hispaniolized. Which allegations I reserve in Petto as back cards to play when others cannot come in. By pumping Leslie I have discovered that he is linked to the President, perhaps also in fee with him. Whence you may well conclude that all our complaints which have come to his hand are stifled. I wonder how he came to be trusted in anything, old Mr. Pendrick being our procureur and having the Cardinal's ear twenty times for the other's once, and being honest . . . Now as to the point of a Bishop, you know 'tis contrary to my instructions to move anything of that nature; and I assure you as opposite to my thoughts and intentions. For should we mention any such thing, all here would take us for madmen."

Presumably by "bishop" here, Holt means an Ordinary as opposed to a Vicar Apostolic⁶⁶.

On 21 January 1668 Holt wrote to Singleton with further comments on Leslie: "He thinks we have no more to do but to let him lay us flat on our backs that we may afterwards reach him our hands to be helped up." The Procurator of Douay, Edward Lutton, one of Dr. Leyburne's opponents, "hath sent a relation of the state of the College, as he calls it, but 'tis rather a boyish declamation"⁶⁷. By February Holt was getting tired: "I am almost killed with standing three hours in antecameras . . . here will be nothing done for us nor against us at this conjuncture. 'Twere but prudence to recall me this spring."

On 21 April, Holt wrote to Dean Ellis warning him that the Brussels Internunciature was hostile to the Chapter in the Douay affair. In May, Holt was urging Singleton and Thomas Carre (the latter confessor to the English nuns in the Fosse S. Victoire Paris) to lay detailed accusations against Dr. Leyburne to the Paris Nuncio, Bargellini⁶⁸. (Little did Holt realize that Bergellini would write to Cardinal Frances Barberini in the following November, warning him that the Chaptermen were infected with Jansenism and were planning to elect a bishop without the authority of the Holy See)⁶⁹.

In May a special congregation for English affairs was set up in Rome, consisting of the Cardinal Protector (Francesco Barberini), the Cardinal Nephew (Rospigliosi) and Cardinals Chigi, Azzolini and Albizzi, with Mgr. Baldeschi as secretary. For the first time Holt expressed the fear that Philip Howard OP might be made a

to put a Spaniard into a frontier town to be President in a College''⁹⁰.

In September 1669, Agretti, Minister Apostolic in Belgium, arrived in England from Brussels to report on the situation⁹¹. In October Holt warned the Chapter to beware of Agretti: "He is a thorough-paced Jesuit, and the Internunce little better. Take heed of them"⁹². He warned the Chapter not to desert the Dean or permit of his removal: "And pray take example from the Hollanders who, though they admit the Vicar as an extraordinary person, yet conserve divers Chapters, and permit the Vicar to meddle only as much as they please. I say let us imitate them in conserving our Chapter, not in admitting a Vicar. They know Mr. Dean is a person beyond exception and therefore conclude that if he were removed the rest of the building would fall. Pray observe that Agretti's business is but to feel your pulses, as Panzani's was before him, and then give a relation hither. Yet they[the Jesuits] vexed him [Panzani] so, that his relation yet extant in the Propaganda is totally against them and favourable to our predecessors"⁹³. This last remark is a reasonable indication that Holt was getting access to Propaganda Archives, perhaps through William Leslie the archivist.

Meanwhile Leyburne decided to come to Rome⁹⁴. On the news of his arrival there in November, Holt, perhaps frightened of what had happened in the days of the Appellants, burned most of his correspondence from the Chapter. Holt met Leyburne and reported that he "spoke pretty civilly" and that he said he was for the "old way of our ancestors, for the old clergy" and that he wanted to be rid of the burden of the Presidency⁹⁵. But one of the consequences of his visit, according to Holt, was that he succeeded in clearing himself in the eyes of the Protector from the charges which the Chapter had made against him, with the result that the Protector cooled markedly towards Holt⁹⁶. In order to secure peace between the London Chapter and the rest of the Clergy, Dr. Leyburne resigned the Presidency of Douay at the end of 1669, and early in the new year his nephew John Leyburne was appointed in his place by the Internuncio⁹⁷.

However, before the arrival in Rome of Agretti's report on the English situation, which favoured (with reservations) the appointment of Howard as Vicar Apostolic, Clement IX died on 9 December 1669, and affairs were once more at a standstill.

The Agency of Thomas Forbes.

Holt stayed in Rome to see the new Pope, Clement X, elected on 29 April 1670,

proposals exhaustively with arguments pro and con. In principle it favoured the appointment of a Vicar Apostolic, who must be moderate and prudent — the painful experience with Richard Smith of Chalcedon was ruefully recalled. Such an authority was necessary to restore order and discipline among the clergy (the idea of an Archpriest was ruled out), and to obviate the necessity and expense of maintaining a series of Agents, procurators and “solleccitatori” at Rome⁷⁴. The Congregation had weighed the risks involved: it was not thought that such an appointment would increase the persecution against Catholics. As for the King, information from various sources indicated that he was not opposed to the idea in principle, but wished the matter to be deferred to a more favourable opportunity. As for Dr. Leyburne at Douay, Holt’s complaints had clearly made some impression. Leyburne’s good faith was not put in question, but the Internuncio was instructed to see if he could persuade him to retire on grounds of age and come to live in Rome, with the proviso that his nephew John Leyburne should succeed him in the Presidency⁷⁵.

Although Holt did not know of all this, it says little for his capacities as a diplomatist that he had placed at the head of a list of possible successors to Leyburne which he gave to the Assessor on 5 June, the names of Thomas Shepherd and Edward Lutton, two men whom Leyburne had ejected from the College⁷⁶. However, despite all rebuffs from the Congregation, Holt continued his campaign against Leyburne, his main policy now being to bring the question of Douay into the international field, and to try to set the French interest against the Spanish⁷⁷. As for the question of a bishop, Holt’s suspicions began to increase that Philip Howard OP was the coming candidate. On 8 September he wrote to John Leyburne (now secretary of the Chapter) deploring any suggestion that the Queen should urge Howard’s candidature. John Leyburne evidently reproved Holt for so bluntly discountenancing the Assessor’s suggestion of Howard, but Holt was unrepentant⁷⁸.

Howard had in fact already, on 3 July, written to William Leslie proposing himself as the most suitable person to be Vicar Apostolic, since the Queen, whose Grand Almoner he was, was entitled to a bishop under the terms of the marriage treaty. He also proposed that Rome should establish an arbiter between Sergeant and George Leyburne⁷⁹. Meanwhile John Leyburne had been sounding the Chaptermen outside London as to their feelings about Howard’s candidature⁸⁰. Holt strongly disapproved of this procedure and insisted on official instructions in writing from the Dean and Secretary before he approached the Protector concerning Philip Howard: “I admire [i.e. am surprised at] your order [i.e. method] of petitioning for

a bishop . . . we must have the King's consent and something to show for it . . . to demand such a thing is to seek the ruin of the clergy." John Leyburne's letters to him are "set to so melancholy a tune that they only add to my distracted thoughts." "Is it come to polling," he asks, "whether we shall have a clergy or no clergy. 'Tis high time for me to retire for . . . I had rather live a saint in my own country than be buried amongst the saints in a strange soil. You have a mind to try my fidelity, and I to live and die a true clergy-man"⁸¹.

But despite Holt's disapproval, Howard's candidature was considered as likely in many quarters. Indeed, Ralph Sheldon, arriving in Rome with Lord Lumley in January 1669, recorded in his diary the gossip he had picked up from Pendrick and Holt himself: "Mr Howard, Lord Almoner to the Queen endeavours in the Propaganda Fide to be made Bishop in England: Mr Leslie his agent"⁸². Cosimo de Medici, visiting England in the spring of the same year, stressed the necessity of some authority to put an end to the dissensions and disorders amongst the clergy: "To settle the differences at once, it has been wished at Rome to consecrate, as titular bishop in England, some ecclesiastic of integrity and talent, a native of the kingdom, who may watch over the missions in the same manner as is done in Holland. For this purpose they cast their eye upon Philip Howard, Grand Almoner to the Queen, having ascertained that the King was in no way averse from such a step; but the affairs of the kingdom being in a condition not very favourable to the Catholics, owing to the inveteracy of the Parliament, it was thought unseasonable, and was judged more prudent, the same having been hinted by the King, to put off the execution of such a proceeding to some other more favourable opportunity. In the meantime, the Bishops of Ireland perform the episcopal functions for the benefit of the Catholics, and come over occasionally to exercise their charge in the best manner in their power"⁸³.

The appointment of six Irish Bishops in the course of the first half of 1669⁸⁴ gave some grounds for hope that Propaganda was prepared to take some action in relation to England. Holt's decision to stay on in Rome during the summer heats was partly actuated by the fear that Propaganda might do something without his knowing it. He maintained his policy of urging the appointment of an Ordinary from the ranks of the Chapter, and seemed to have hopes of favourable treatment from Mgr. Baldeschi, secretary of the English Congregation⁸⁵. In fact, for a short time he thought that he had succeeded in his efforts. On 27 July he wrote to Pulton: "My chief request of us having an absolute ordinary is granted, but the difficulty

sees and hears how this Prelate has been both in his own country and here persecuted by his adversaries and ill protected by those who would make the world believe that they are the upholders of episcopacy"¹¹⁴. Nonetheless, Forbes took the pains to transmit to the Chapter the decrees of Propaganda relating to Dutch affairs¹¹⁵; and indeed Neercassel returned to his own country well satisfied with what he had achieved in Rome.

The question of Howard's appointment dragged on. In November 1671 Forbes reported to Holt the substance of a conversation with Baldeschi before a meeting of the special Congregation for English affairs. Baldeschi had said that Howard was to have the same faculties as Chalcedon, but somewhat restricted so far as the Regulars were concerned: "I told him that I believed my Lord Almoner would not accept the restriction since all Bishops everywhere have an illimited power over regulars"¹¹⁶. Still nothing happened, and by January 1672 Forbes suggested that one of the reasons for the delay might be that Rome was waiting for the outcome of the Duke of York's marriage negotiations¹¹⁷.

The Chapter met in April 1672. Among their resolutions it was "unanimously agreed not to admit the title of Vicar Apostolic as a thing of great danger in many respects . . . 'Twas judged also unanimously not to be in the power of a new Bishop to dissolve the Chapter"¹¹⁸. Meanwhile Forbes had been keeping his ear close to the ground in Rome. At the end of April he reported that "Baldeschi was very busy seeking out in the Propaganda a copy of the faculties they use to give Apostolic Vicars"¹¹⁹. On 7 May he informed Holt that the Congregation had ordered the Internuncio to call Howard over to Flanders to consecrate him "with such faculties as Calcedon had under the name of Vicar Apostolic", but that nothing was decided concerning the status of the Chapter. Forbes advised that one of the Chapter should go over to Flanders with Howard to hinder the title of Vicar Apostolic being imposed¹²⁰. On 20 August Forbes wrote again, but in much stronger terms: the Congregation, he said, intended to make Howard "a petty Apostolic Vicar, with so limitate and subordinate a power to Baldeschi that it would neither be his [Howard's] nor your honour nor the good of the Catholic faith there to admit an imaginary episcopal character without an ordinary, stable and illimited jurisdiction. Besides, if you once admit this slavery, you will never be able to get out of it, for this court aims at nothing else but to make you altogether dependent even in trifles from the Congregation of the Propaganda, that is to say from Baldeschi"¹²¹. In fact, the special Congregation for England had decreed Howard's appointment as Bishop *in partibus* and Vicar Apostolic of England on

Vicar Apostolic⁷⁰. Then, on 26 May, he wrote to William Pulton, a Chapterman, telling him of an interview with the Protector, who had recently received a letter from George Leyburne: "His Eminence is hard to be persuaded but that there be some favourers of Mr Blaclo amongst us. I think it were good to contrive a letter of Vindication drawn out of the Encyclical and Manifest [two pamphlets in the controversy between Dr. Leyburne and the Chapter]^{70a}, comparing also Mr. Geo. Leyburne to Mr. Geo. Blackwell [the Archpriest], who in like manner slandered as schismatics all who would not permit him *dominari in clero*"⁷¹.

After the Congregation had met at the end of July, Holt wrote a long, sad letter to Dean Ellis on the failure of his mission: after the meeting, the Protector and Assessors had called him into the room and had told him they could not take away the President of Douay's authority because he was old, had served the Church long and had suffered much for religion, and had formerly been liked by the Clergy. The Congregation also raised objections against the Dean and Chapter, "a quell Capitolo noi non approviamo qui"; but, added Holt, "so long as there's no judicial act of reprobation I hope words will not put us in any confusion." The Protector told Holt that Airolti, the new Brussels Internuncio, would examine the business of Douay but that Abbot Montagu "had refused to meddle in our concern of the College by reason that it seemed a business of intrigue"⁷². On 11 August Holt reported a further interview with the Protector, "who seeming conscious of breaking our heads, pretended a desire to give us a plaster i.e. to find some person who should be (as he termed it) indifferent, neither too much Jesuited nor too much the contrary." When the Assessor put forward the name of Philip Howard OP, Holt, who suspected William Leslie behind the proposal, became angry. "What I replied I conceive not fit to set down here, but 'twas so home and in so plain terms, that not only put him to silence, but moved the Cardinal to take my part and bid him hold his peace of the point till we made instance." Holt felt there was very little point in staying on longer in Rome and asked for his recall⁷³.

Holt need not, in fact, have been so disparaging about the efforts of the Congregation. As early as April 1668 it had dispatched a long and detailed appreciation of the English situation to the Internuncio at Brussels. Apparently Leyburne had written to Rome in favour of a Vicar Apostolic with the title as in Holland, to be followed by the appointment of a Prefect of the Mission with twelve assistants in various parts of the country (or alternatively, the dissolution of the present Chapter and the erection of a new one). The Congregation had considered Leyburne's

could obtain concerning the activities of Propaganda relating to the question of a Bishop for England and the status of the London Chapter. One of the most interesting documents is a long memorandum by Baldeschi which Holt translated into English¹²⁷. Baldeschi urged the necessity of a Bishop for discipline and for authority over the Regulars. The only suitable candidate was Howard, who had been recommended by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the Brussels Internuncio, Airoldi, the Minister Apostolic, Agretti, and Oliver Plunket the Archbishop of Armagh. The Chapter, through their Agent, had now also put him forward as Bishop, though before they had seemed averse to his exaltation. The Bishop should not be an Ordinary: in this Baldeschi agreed with the Cardinals. An Ordinary would arouse the jealousy of the Protestant Bishops "and irritate them as if some novelty were a-plotting." Howard should therefore be made a Vicar Apostolic, "from whom you [the Cardinals of Propaganda] may arbitrarily either take away or moderate the authority." As to Howard's powers, Baldeschi urged the Cardinals to consider "if those must be limited which are wont to be granted to Apostolic Vicars, and in what your Eminences may consider according to the dictamens of your prudence, and especially if (it) be convenient to tie his hands in such a fashion that he be hindered from confirming the Chapter or troubling unduly the Regulars; and the dextrous manner which must be observed in doing this, that neither he nor the Secular ecclesiastics be aware of it, nor take offence: a point that hath need of particular advertence, the Agent of the Clergy having divulged here that if the Bishop which is to be made shall not be furnished at least with the same authority formerly granted to the Bishops of Calcedon, that he would neither be received nor obeyed."

Baldeschi turned then to the question of the Chapter. Agretti and others had reported adversely on it; the Chapter did not deserve to be confirmed as they had pretended to themselves jurisdiction and authority *sede vacante* which other Chapters have, but knowing that they were not confirmed by the Holy See. The Chapter had given faculties to administer parochial sacraments and given authority to Aubigny to perform the Royal marriage. Agretti had said that this should be borne in mind when considering the nullity of the Chapter acts. Agretti had also reported that the Chapter were willing to subscribe to a declaration of obedience to the Holy See and to a rejection of Blaclo's doctrine, but that such a declaration could not be made public. "Neither are the offers of blind obedience to be relied on whilst 'tis seen in effect that their conceived hatred against the President of Douay to have proceeded in great measure because he would have obliged the

Alumni to have sworn obedience to the orders of this Holy See.” Howard, the Jesuit Provincial and others had advised that the Chapter should be declared null: “Justice persuades it and every other consideration seems to oblige us to do it. But for the time of executing it, almost all concur in the opinion that it be deferred, because we are to deal in a case of disorder and long continued abuse, for the removing of which the time is to be sought. And also a dexterity, not to cause by the remedy greater disorders than spring from the abuse itself; as also there seems danger of the Chaptermen’s not obeying, whence might spring great tumults, knowing the adherents they have amongst the ecclesiastics and secular [i.e. laity], which last induced by kindred and friendship, and the first by interest, by reason of the Chapter’s having the management of a certain fund left for ecclesiastics, and that they distribute it amongst their adherents; neither would it contribute to destroy that boldness wherewith they act, or that which follows, viz. the opposition of Regulars. Much more for sustaining their authority the Queen should [i.e. would] interest herself, for not to put in doubt the validity of her marriage, unto which . . . acted as . . . parish priest one deputed by the Chapter.

“Moreover, to provide not only against old disorders, and hinder that new ones spring not up, but also to smooth or facilitate the way for the declarations of this court, by the nullity of the Chapter, there seems to be no better way than to make a Bishop. This makes the authority of the Chapters legally instituted to cease; much more would it make the usurped authority of these English priests to cease; it being to be hoped that the management of their fund left for ecclesiastics, notwithstanding the opposition of the Chaptermen, would in a like progress of time fall into the Bishop’s hand. By which means he would fortify himself and his party and weaken that of the Capitulars, towards whom he might proceed afterwards with greater severity; when they by being accustomed to obey the Bishops, which the King said he would oblige them to do, that haughtiness or pride being laid aside which is proper to their nation, and which is increased in them by the long exercise of an usurped authority”¹²⁸.

There is little wonder that Forbes now called Baldeschi “a most wicked enemy of the Clergy” saying, “he is a fellow that cares neither for God nor man, but so far as either interest or ambition permits him. So long as he is in charge we can expect no good”¹²⁹.

In April 1673 Baldeschi became assessor of the Holy Office, and Mgr. Urban

Cerri succeeded him in Propaganda. But Baldeschi took with him the affair of the English Bishop and Chapter¹³⁰. The See of Helenopolis *i.p.i.* was kept vacant for Howard till 1673, when it was disposed of to another¹³¹. But after 1672 the practicability of a Bishop for England receded more and more until the accession of James II¹³². Howard was made Cardinal in May 1675. On 25 July he wrote to William Leslie at Propaganda, thanking him, rather smugly, for his congratulations on the promotion, "there having been so little of human interest engaged to produce this change, I may with you look upon it as coming from the hand of God in a particular manner"¹³³.

Some Comments and Conclusions.

We have given this history of the negotiations at some length, with extensive quotations from hitherto unpublished documents, in order to enable the reader to form his own judgment, not only as to the course of events, but also as to the emotional tone and intentions of the participants. But perhaps it may not be amiss to attempt some general observations of our own.

The Chapter must have been quite out of touch with reality if they thought that their repeated insistence on an Ordinary would be accepted. Nowhere in the negotiations is there any sign that Propaganda were thinking of anything else but a Vicar Apostolic. When one Agent, Dr. Gage, had the sense to report that Propaganda were prepared to grant a Vicar Apostolic and advocated the acceptance of that as a compromise, he was at once recalled by John Sergeant, the Secretary of the Chapter. Time and again we find outside observers interpreting the Chapter's intransigence as implying that the Chapter did not really want a Bishop at all.

The Agency was bedevilled by having more than one objective. The question of a Bishop seems to have been subsidiary in the mind of the Chapter to two other considerations: the confirmation and authority of the Chapter itself, and the removal of Dr. George Leyburne from Douay.

The quarrel with Dr. Leyburne makes very painful reading indeed. Apart from the doctrinal controversy concerning "Blacloism", there can be little doubt that the Civil Wars left deep wounds among the Clergy. In 1647 and again in 1649 and 1655, the London Chapter were toying with the idea of submission to the Independents and to Cromwell, and it was Dr. Leyburne who stood in their way. At the Restoration the situation was a little ironical, for it was the Chapter who were the advocates of the Oath of Allegiance to Charles II. After the Restoration, one of

the main objects of the Chapter's policy was to break the credit of Dr. Leyburne and to undermine his authority at Douay. Some of the complaints that were sent in to Rome have to be seen to be believed, so petty and trivial are they. An instance of Dr. Leyburne's brutality was that he had turned a boy out of the sanatorium who had become sick through smoking tobacco (admittedly, on doctor's orders)! An instance of his maladministration was that he had ordered English troops visiting the College to be served with wine instead of beer, and on another occasion he had quarrelled with the Procurator over whether the students should have two barrels of strong beer or three of weak¹³⁴! When eventually Leyburne expelled two of the College staff, Thomas Shepherd and Edward Lutton, for consistent mischief-making among the staff and students and attempting to undermine his authority by appealing direct to the Chapter, it was precisely those two names that the Chapter had the impudence to suggest to the Protector as possible successors to Leyburne in the Presidentship. Of course Leyburne was old and obstinate and quick tempered, with the tongue and pen of a blunt northcountryman, but the way in which the Chapter badgered and baited him and sacrificed the well-being of Douay to their own personal animosity, makes most unedifying reading.

The continuance of a certain Chapter policy is maintained in a fairly consistent chain. John Sergeant, pupil and supporter of Blaclo, is Secretary of the Chapter from 1655-67, and the principal adviser in the day-to-day policy of the Agents. When the moderate John Leyburne is appointed Secretary, Holt, then Agent, seems to correspond more freely with John Singleton (the Treasurer) and William Pulton, two Chaptermen who favour Sergeant's policy. Then the intransigent Holt himself becomes Secretary, and corresponds with his successor and nominee, the new Agent Thomas Forbes. How far, then the policy of the London Chapter was truly representative of the secular Clergy as a whole, and how far of a very small clique, is an important consideration which any future historian of English Catholicism in the seventeenth century will have to consider, though it is outside the scope of the present article.

There was one period when the appointment of a Bishop seemed definitely practicable, and that was directly after the Restoration. The failure then was due to a variety of reasons. The candidature of two obvious figures, Dr. Leyburne and Abbot Montagu, was blocked by the Chapter because of the loyalty of these two men to the Stuarts during the Civil War. The candidature of the compromise figure, Henry Taylor, was blocked by the personal intervention of Queen Henrietta Maria.

Aubigny's candidature is said to have failed because of his suspected Jansenism, but that is not the whole story. The entire project was ruined because the Chapter allowed itself to play Clarendon's game in the matter of discriminatory (i.e. anti-Jesuit) penal legislation, protestations of allegiance, and proposals for reunion-all-round. (Of course the Chapter were not the only dabblers in this kind of thing. On the question of the Oath of Allegiance they were greatly influenced by Peter Walsh and his Irish associates. Santa Clara OFM, and Cressy OSB—a former member of Clarendon's circle—were also fascinated by plans for re-union.) Indeed the situation became so dangerous that Abbot Montagu urged Propaganda not to condemn the Irish Remonstrance of 1662 (which the Chapter had endorsed), in case this would provoke its imposition on both English and Irish Catholics as a Government reprisal¹³⁵. Clarendon and Ormonde had an almost pathological dislike of Catholicism; one cannot help feeling that the series of discussions after the Restoration relating to the removal of the Penal Laws, and the Bellings mission, were never meant to succeed, and were initiated by them purely for the purpose of causing fresh divisions among the Catholics.

With Clarendon out of the way in 1667, and Ormonde temporarily in eclipse, there might have been another chance. Certainly, the radical renovation of the Irish hierarchy in 1669 raised high hopes, though Archbishop Peter Talbot showed himself a very poor judge of character in putting so much trust in the good offices of a man like Buckingham¹³⁶. If the affair of an English Bishop had speedily been brought to a conclusion in 1669 it might have had a chance of succeeding. But the obstacles then were the long-drawn-out quarrel over the Douay Presidency and the obduracy of the Agent, Holt, in refusing to countenance the candidature of Howard. By the time that Dr. Leyburne had resigned from Douay, and Baldeschi had got the affair of the Vicar Apostolic of Holland out of the way and could concentrate on England, the political opportunity had slipped by.

It may be tempting to lay the blame for the troubles of the Church on the Roman Curia. My personal impression, however, is that Propaganda comes out of this particular piece of history quite well. In the space of 10 years it sent three emissaries¹³⁷ to report on the state of English affairs at first hand—de Vechii in 1662, Agretti in 1669, and Airoidi in 1670. When one looks at the extreme divergence of the reports and complaints sent in to Propaganda by the English themselves, one can only admire its patience. It went slowly to work, to be sure, and the long-windedness of its memoranda sometimes makes tedious reading, but its primary

concern was the salvation of souls. It was prepared to tolerate a situation that, canonically speaking, was most unsatisfactory, for fear that a sudden and radical decision might either cause a schism among the English Catholics (a situation which did in fact arise in Holland at the end of the century), or else provoke increased persecution from the Government. If a criticism may be made, it is on the lack of internal security in Propaganda. The essence of diplomacy is secrecy. We have seen, however, that Forbes, the Chapter Agent, was able to get hold of confidential material. The indiscretions of William Leslie, Keeper of the Propaganda Archives, have been the subject of recent study by Malcolm V. Hay¹³⁸. For the English Government, Sir Joseph Williamson had on his payroll in Rome the Abbate Scarlatti, secretary to Cardinal Antonio Barberini, to say nothing of a regular news service from Joseph Kent, the Consul at Leghorn, who was moved specially to Rome in 1665¹³⁹. That Baldeschi was clearly aware of the difficulty is evident from the fact that, in the matter of Howard's briefs in May 1672, he by-passed the General Congregation altogether and took the decision of the Special Congregation direct to the Pope. His manoeuvre was successful, for as late as 12 December 1673 the Chapter were in the dark about what had actually happened; Holt then wrote to Forbes: "This is to desire a favour of you, if you can compass it; and 'tis that you will be pleased to try whether you can privately get a copy of a certain Brief which (as we are informed) was made above a year ago in the Congregation. It was made for My Lord Almoner and in it some authority granted him, as a Vicar or Bishop, but what the limits of it were is unknown to him and us; a copy of it would be very acceptable to both; and that such a thing was done, is certain, as divers have asserted, both of your Court and others, though your Grandees deny any such thing now to have been done. If it could be discovered 'twould be a great light to us how to proceed"¹⁴⁰.

Baldeschi maintained close personal supervision over the matter for as long as possible. When he became assessor to the Holy Office in 1673 he kept the affair of the Bishop and Chapter in his own hands, and as late as 1677 his successor at the Propaganda, Mgr. Urban Cerri, reported to Innocent XI that the Holy Office and not Propaganda were still in charge of it, in order that secrecy might be better maintained¹⁴¹.

In 1685 John Leyburne was eventually appointed Vicar Apostolic, and he arrived in England under oath not to recognize the Chapter. Speaking of the Chapter's activities in the preceding period, Mgr. Philip Hughes says that "it served as a

rallying point for English Catholicism . . . it never ceased to keep before the mind of the English Catholics and of the officials in Rome, that what most of all was needed in England was the restoration of Episcopal rule. It was but justice that the chain of events which resulted in the restoration of 1685 should begin with the Chapter's activity"¹⁴². The present writer is reluctantly forced to a contrary conclusion. Far from being a rallying point for English Catholicism, the Chapter was repeatedly a source of contention and strife. Indeed, one of the major factors contributing to the long delay in the appointment of a Vicar Apostolic for England was the policy and conduct of the Chapter and its Agents.

NOTES

The principal manuscript sources are from the Westminster Cathedral Archives (WA) and the Public Record Office (PRO). The documents at Westminster are principally from the former Chapter Archives (parts of which were transferred to Westminster in the 19th Century) and chiefly comprise letters from the Roman Agents and from English clergy abroad, drafts of letters from the Chapter, and copies of the minutes of Chapter meetings. The documents in the Public Record Office consist chiefly of transcripts from Roman sources, principally the Barberini Archives. It is to be regretted, however, that the PRO lacks a full sequence of transcripts from the reports of the Brussels Internuncio and the Paris Nuncio for the period after the Restoration.

I am especially indebted to His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster and to his Archivist, Fr. B. Fisher, for permission to consult and quote extensively from the Westminster Archives.

1. At Rome, Smith was considered to have offered his resignation and it was accepted; see L. Hicks SJ. CRS XLI 46n., and authorities there cited: contrast P. Hughes *Rome and the Counter Reformation in England*, 1944, 390, who gives no authorities for his opinion.
2. WA. xxx. 363, 383.
3. J. Gillow, *Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics*, London, 1885, IV 222; C. Dodd, *Church History of England*, "Brussels" 1742, III 304.
4. R. Pugh, *Blaclo's Cabal*, n.p. 1680, 74-77.
5. WA. xxx. 391, "Quaerita super Autoritate Ep. Calcedon. in Anglia;" it is suggested that twenty-six years of the Chapter's existence renders Smith's approbation unnecessary. See also WA. xxx. 423, where Smith refused to surrender the right to appoint Canons despite the request of Mark Harrington, George Gage and three other members of the

Chapter.

6. WA. xxx. 521, 597.
7. WA. xxxi. 37.
8. WA. xxxi. 41.
9. De la Torre had owed his appointment to the recommendation of Chigi, then Nuncio at Cologne and now Cardinal Protector of England (L.J. Rogier, *Geschiedenis van het Katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16e en de 17e Eeuw*, 2nd ed. Amsterdam 1947, II 181).
10. WA. xxxi. 9.
11. WA. xxxi. 13.
12. WA. B Series xlvii (originally Stonyhurst MS Anglia viii) no. 91, letter of 18 Feb. 1655 from Florence.
13. PRO 31/9/96.
14. PRO 31/9/96, letter of 21 Jan. 1656.
15. PRO 31/9/96, letter of 2 June 1657.
16. WA. xxxi. 297; letter misdated 1656. Peter Fitton, Dean of the Chapter, resided at Florence, from 1653 till his death in 1657, as librarian to the Grand Duke of Tuscany.
17. WA. xxxi. 273; letter misdated 1653. For Digby's mission see V. Gabrieli "La Missione di Sir Kenelm Digby alla Corte di Innocenzo X, 1645-1648", *English Miscellany* V, Rome 1954, 247/289.
18. WA. xxxi. 285.
19. WA. xxxi. 291.
20. WA. xxxi. 301.
21. WA. xxxi. 307, letter of 10 April 1656.
22. PRO 31/9/130 (Barb. 8622). During the Civil War and Commonwealth period Fr. Courtney had been supplying Barberini with a series of very well informed newsletters from England. When Algernon Sidney visited Rome in November 1660, he reported Fr. Courtney as "sick, old and decrepit", but that Cardinal Francesco Barberini "is very little changed since I formerly saw him: though he is old, he is so fresh and strong as to be likely to live many years". (*Sydney Papers*, ed. R.W. Blencowe, Lond. 1825, 244).
23. WA. xxxi. 323, 331.
24. WA. xxxi. 357.
25. WA. xxxi. 431.
26. WA. xxxi. 465. The full text is in J. Berington, *The Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani*, Lond. 1793, 297.
27. WA. xxxi. 467.
28. C. Dodd, *Church History of England*, "Brussels" 1742, III 304. It is fairly clear, however, from WA. xxxi. 421, that he actually went to Rome.
29. WA. xxxi. 509, letter from Thomas Barker 21 Dec. 1658.
30. WA. xxxi. 515. Gage left England in March 1659, left France in April and arrived in Rome in June. He left Rome in May 1661 and was back in England in July and present at the General Chapter Meeting in September (WA. xxxiv. 466, Gage's Journal).
- 30a. The Congregation for English affairs seems to have been a sub-committee of the

Congregation de Propaganda Fide set up as and when required, cf. note 70 and text.

31. WA. xxxii.33. Gage's letters to Sergeant are addressed to "Signor Carlos".
32. WA. xxxii. 45.
33. WA. xxxii. 47.
34. i.e. Dom Gregory Bernard Palmes OSB (*alias* Conyers), Procurator at Rome for the English Benedictine Congregation 1657-1663.
35. Bodley's Library MS Rawl. D.840, f. 268v. It is reproduced as part of a MS pamphlet, presumably written for publication, dated 16 April 1673. The difference in tone between this and the letter to Sergeant of 22 March 1660 implies a certain degree of two-facedness in Gage.
36. WA. xxxii. 51.
37. WA. xxxii. 75.
38. WA. xxxii. 59, 131, 135.
39. Writing under the name of Peter Hoburg (an anagram of Robert Pughe) to Barberini, 13 November 1661 (Stonyhurst MS Anglia V 58). The letter is printed, without realization of Pugh's authorship, as an appendix to *Remarks on a Book Entitled Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani*, by C. Plowden SJ, Liège 1794.
40. PRO 31/9/97; 8 and 28 Aug. 1660.
- 40a. Several books on the question of allegiance appeared about this time, but none have elsewhere been attributed to Sir Kenelm Digby. *Reflexions upon the Oathes of Supremacy* . . . 1661, is attributed to John Sergeant (Wing STC S2588); *Some few Questions Concerning the Oath of Allegiance* . . . 1661, to Peter Walsh (Wing STC W641-643); and *Observations upon the Oath* . . . [1662?] to Sir John Winter (Wing STC W3081-2).
41. PRO 31/9/98: ff. 228, 238, 244, 259, 261, 277, 278. The letters are subscribed with the name of "Vigilio".
42. On 16 July 1661 a Lords Committee under the presidency of the Duke of York and including the Lord Treasurer and the Lord Privy Seal, was set up to consider preparing a bill to remove certain penal statutes. On 18 July the Attorney General was co-opted, and on 25 July, he was instructed to prepare a draft bill for the consideration of the Committee. Among the proposals were: that concerning 27 Eliz. 2. "the first clause concerning priests, Jesuits etc. (except Jesuits) be repealed"; that concerning 3 Jac. 4. "no clauses be repealed as to the Jesuits"; that priests should notify their address to the Secretary of State within 20 days of arrival in England; "that an Oath of Allegiance shall be taken by all priests and Roman Catholics"; "that no Jesuits shall come into this Kingdom upon pain of High Treason". The document upon which this information is based, WA. xxxii. 275, is endorsed "What Mr. Waring [i.e. Ellis, the Dean of the Chapter] judged proper to be tendered to the Parliament in 1661". The Dean had thus evidently been consulted by the Lords Committee and the Attorney General on the draft proposals for the bill.
43. e.g. WA. xxxii. 225, where the Jesuits are accused of adhering to Cromwell during the Commonwealth. Fr. Martin Grene SJ, wrote *An Account of the Life and Doctrine of the Jesuits* . . . 1661 (Wing STC G1825) to answer calumnies current against the loyalty of the Jesuits. In *The Jesuits Reasons Unreasonable* . . . 1662 (Wing STC J725) (attributed to Sergeant), the writer maintains that the exclusion of the

Jesuits from any benefits of a relaxation of the Penal Laws is justified; it is right that they should be sacrificed for the general good of the English Catholics.

44. WA. xxxii. 294 sq.
45. Southwark Cathedral Archives MS 106. iii. 391. This is a nineteenth century transcript of a document in Chapter Archives (and not now at Westminster). It is inserted loosely into a grangerized copy of Dodd's *Church History* vol. iii, which Canon Tierney evidently intended as the basis for the uncompleted volumes of his revised edition.
46. P. Walsh, *History and Vindication of the Loyal Formulary* . . . 1674, 55-56.
47. *Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal*, Cambridge 1932, Ch. VII.
48. WA. xxxii. 391; signed RSP (?Robert Pugh).
49. Mgr. A.S. Barnes, "Charles II and Reunion with Rome", *Monthly Review* XIII, Dec. 1903, 146. A most useful article, in addition to sources cited by Professor Clark, but tantalizingly vague on the precise location of its sources.
50. PRO SP 9/203/7, 8, 9. It is hoped to publish these at some future date.
51. M.A. Tierney, *The History and Antiquities of* . . . *Arundel*, London 1834, II 524-5. See also M.V. Hay, *The Jesuits and the Popish Plot*, London 1934, 98 sq.
52. WA. xxxii. 584. Alexander VII died 22 May 1667.
53. Holt was b. 1629, entered Eng. Coll. Rome 1652, ordained priest Dec. 1656, sent to Eng. April 1659 (Foley, *Records SJ VI*, London 1880, 387; CRS, x1, 52).
54. WA. xxxii. 587.
55. WA. xxxii. 588.
56. WA. xxxii. 613.
57. WA. xxxii. 619. The MS being slightly damaged, a few obvious lacunae have been silently supplied.
58. WA. xxxii. 620-622. See note above.
59. WA. xxxii. 627-629.
60. WA. xxxii. 641.
61. WA. xxxii. 645.
62. At the end of September, in a joint letter to the Chapter from Paris, the leading Catholic Clergy there, Montagu, Clifford, Carre and Gough, had suggested that Holt take with him to Rome a general submission from the Chapter to Clement IX; this they considered a necessary preliminary to any Papal decision concerning (i) the question of the relation between the Chapter and Douay, and (ii) the appointment of a Bishop. The Dean replied that the proposal had been rejected by the Chapter, as binding them in advance. Richard Russell, Bishop-elect of Portalegre, privately informed Montagu that the moving force behind the Chapter's refusal was in fact John Sergeant, the Secretary. In view of this evidence of lack of good will, Montagu refused to consider being nominated by the Chapter in their list of *episcopabiles*. The reaction of Clifford, Carre and Gough is not known, but it is clear that Sergeant's attitude was alienating the support of the more influential neutral figures. See R. Pugh, *Black's Cabal* . . . 1680, 108-126.
63. WA. xxxii. 673-687.
64. Agretti, Minister Apostolic to the Internuncio at Brussels, was considered as prejudiced against the Chapter. WA. xxxii. 659, 703-709

65. WA. xxxii. 697. Holt's letters are usually addressed to Captain William Sacarville (or Pulton), a Chapterman living in London, for John Singleton, who lived out of town.
66. WA. xxxii. 701.
67. WA. xxxiii. 5, 7.
68. WA. xxxiii. 33, 35, 37.
69. PRO 31/9/130 (Barb. 8620), 13 Nov. 1668.
70. WA. xxxiii. 39, 45.
- 70a. i.e. *An Encyclical Epistle sent to their Brethren by the Venerable Dean and Chapter of the Catholic Clergy in England, upon occasion of Dr. Leyburn . . .* 1660 (British Museum 3935. b. 33/1); and *A Manifest Publisht to their Brethren by the General Chapter of the English Clergy in Vindication of their Innocency from the False Calumnies laid upon them in a Seditious Libel lately publisht by Dr. Leyburn . . .* 1661 (British Museum 701. h. 4/8).
71. WA. xxxiii. 47. The letter is addressed care of Daniel Arthur, the Irish Catholic merchant of Lothbury, London.
72. WA. xxxiii. 87.
73. WA. xxxiii. 93.
74. Holt himself suggested that the money spent at Rome on the Agency (he was in debt for some 5000 or 6000 crowns at that moment) would be better spent to begin "a little foundation at Paris" (WA. xxxiii. 99). It might also have been spent to help the precarious finances at Douay and to train priests for the mission.
75. PRO 31/9/99, 150-161.
76. WA. xxxiii. 170.
77. WA. xxxiii. 113.
78. WA. xxxiii. 105-106.
79. CRS. xxv. 45 sq.
80. WA. xxxiii. 135, 139, 145, 147, 153, 181.
81. WA. xxxiii. 188, 197.
82. Bodley's Library MS Wood B.14. 61r.
83. *Travels of Cosmo the Third . . .* London 1821, 461 sq.
84. W.M. Brady, *The Episcopal Succession*, Rome 1876, I 227, 239, 336; II 25, 145.
85. WA. xxxiii. 249, 251.
86. WA. xxxiii. 253.
87. W.M. Brady, *op. cit.*, III 106-107.
88. WA. xxxiii. 257, 259, 263.
89. WA. xxxiii. 273.
90. WA. xxxiii. 277, 5 Oct. 1669.
91. W.M. Brady, *op. cit.*, III 107 sq.
92. WA. xxxiii. 289, letter to Pulton.
93. WA. xxxiii. 297.
94. PRO 31/9/137, letter to Barberini 26 Sept. 1669.
95. WA. xxxiii. 301.
96. WA. xxxiii. 307.
97. PRO 31/9/99. 219, 227.

98. WA. xxxiii. 433.
99. M.V. Hay, *Failure in the Far East*, Wetteren (Belgium) 1956, 61 n.l.
100. WA. xxxiii. 493
101. WA. xxxiii. 503.
102. WA. xxxiii. 511.
103. WA. xxxiii. 523.
104. W.M. Brady, *op. cit.*, III 118.
105. WA. xxxiii. 541.
106. WA. xxxiii. 545.
107. His report is in Brady, *op. cit.*, III 119 sq.
108. WA. xxxiii. 557.
109. WA. xxxiii. 695, letter of 3 Jan. 1671.
110. "Ik tot Romen geen kennis off vrienden heb, als eenen enckelen Schotsen priester".
See F. van Hoeck SJ, "Eenige Bijzonderheden over . . . Neercassels Reis naar Rome in 1670", *Archief voor de Geschiedenis van het Aartsbisdom Utrecht*, III (1926), 255.
111. *ibid.*, 257. See also G.J. Hoogewerf, "Twee Reizen van Cosimo de' Medici Prins van Toscane door de Nederlanden 1667-1669", *Historisch Genootschap (te Utrecht)*, 3e Serie no. 41, Amsterdam 1919, 62, 319.
112. For a fuller account of his mission, see R.R. Post, "De Apostolische Vicaris Johannes Neercassel naar Rome", *Mededeelingen van het Nederlandsch Historisch Instituut te Rome*, 2e reeks, Deel IV (1934), 97-132.
113. WA. xxxiii. 607.
114. WA. xxxiii. 609.
115. WA. xxxiii. 621, 657, Decree on the Affairs of Holland 10 March 1671. Also in WA. xxxiii, at ff. 625 and 633, there are Propaganda documents relating to Dutch ecclesiastical affairs of 1623, especially the conflict with the Jesuits. It is possible that these were collected by Bishop Richard Smith at the time and have been misbound in the present volume. I hope to be able to discuss Anglo-Dutch ecclesiastical relations in the 17th century in more detail at some future date.
116. WA. xxxiii. 689.
117. WA. xxxiv. 5.
118. WA. xxxiv. 57.
119. WA. xxxiv. 49.
120. WA. xxxiv. 59.
121. WA. xxxiv. 89.
122. W.M. Brady, *op. cit.*, III 128-129; *Hierarchia Catholica . . . 1667-1730*, ed. R. Ritzler and P. Sefrin, Patavii 1952, V 217.
123. PRO 31/9/99. 306.
124. WM. Brady, *op. cit.* III 129; C.H. Hartman, *Clifford of the Cabal*, Ch. XI. The Internuncio must also have had a secret interview with Arlington during the latter's embassy in the Low Countries. Research by the present writer has failed to bring to light any official reference to the meeting. On 9/19 July, Arlington, Buckingham and Halifax met Monterey in the convent of the English Carmelite nuns at Antwerp—it is possible that the interview with the Internuncio may have taken place there. But

- the mention in the expense account of the embassy of the payment of £200 to the Abbess of Ghent may suggest that Ghent was the rendezvous—it would, of course, have had to be kept secret from Halifax. See PRO SP 84/190. 46, 165.
125. *Journals of the House of Commons*, IX 203-204.
 126. V. Barbour, *Henry Bennet Earl of Arlington*, Washington 1914, 178, 189; PRO 31/3/127 Baschet Trans. Arch. Aff. Étr. Angleterre: no. 103 f. 184, Colbert to Louis XIV, London 11 April 1672; no. 104 f. 211, same to same, London 9 May 1672.
 127. WA. xxxiv. 99 and 103 sq. In subsequent quotations we have used the wording of Holt's rather literal translation.
 128. WA. xxxiv. 103-106. The part of Baldeschi's report relating to Douay College is unfortunately missing.
 129. WA. xxxiv. 121, Forbes to Holt 24 Dec. 1672.
 130. WA. xxxiv. 189, Forbes to Holt 1 April 1671: "The affair of the Bishop and Chapter are still in Baldeschi's hand, for which I am heartily sorry"; see also Brady, *op. cit.*, III 130.
 131. *Hierarchia Catholica* . . . V 217.
 132. For the subsequent period see B. Hemphill OSB, *The Early Vicars Apostolic of England 1685-1750*, London 1954.
 133. CRS XXV (1925), 67.
 134. WA. xxxiii. 27.
 135. PRO 31/9/137 (Barb. 8659), 26 March 1664.
 136. P. Moran, *Spicilegium Ossoriense* . . . Dublin 1874, I 472.
 137. Four, if one counts Dr. Leyburne himself in 1660.
 138. *Failure in the Far East*, Wetteren (Belgium) 1956, *passim*.
 139. PRO SP 85/8 *passim*.
 140. WA. xxxiv. 233.
 141. WA. xxxiv. 189 and W.M. Brady, *op. cit.*; III 130.
 142. *Clergy Review* X (Sept. 1935), 201.

